



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,197	04/10/2001	Thomas C. Welch	440379	9956

23548 7590 01/03/2003
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER

CHIESA, RICHARD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1724

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N . 09/720,197	Applicant(s) WELCH ET AL.	
	Examiner Richard L. Chiesa	Art Unit 1724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10 and 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 05 December 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 - 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on December 5, 2002 has been entered.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing correction filed on December 5, 2002 has been approved by the examiner. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-16 are again rejected as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied in paragraphs 7, 8, 10, and 11 on pages 4 and 5 of the last Office action (Paper No. 7) dated June 6, 2002.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicants' arguments filed on December 5, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons explained below.

Art Unit: 1724

In the first place, Nakayama et al's Figure 2 reveals a filter wherein a thickness of a pleat tip region at a point spaced about one to four pleat leg thicknesses from the end of the pleat tip region is less than or equal to about twice the pleat leg thickness. The pleat leg thickness in Nakayama et al's Figure 2 is 7 mm and a point 7 mm from the end of the pleat tip region reveals a pleat tip region thickness of 14 mm which is twice the pleat leg thickness. Therefore, applicants' assertion that Nakayama et al's Figure 2 is merely an idealized conception is unfounded. It is only reasonable to assume that Nakayama et al's Figure 2 is actual size and thus shows the claimed size relationships. See *In re Jureit*, 161 USPQ 731.

Secondly, Pall clearly shows in Figures 1, 3-5, 7, and 8 reformed pleat tip regions. In fact, Pall even shows dies 15 and 35 in Figures 4 and 8 respectively that appear to be virtually identical to the dies 54 and 55 shown in applicants' Figures 5-7.

Finally, there appears to be little doubt upon inspection of Kadoya et al's Figures 1 and 6 that Kadoya et al disclose a method of producing a filter having pleats free of bulbous tip regions. Certainly, Kadoya et al do not show the bulbous tip regions defined by applicants as reference characters 11(a) and 11(b) in applicants' Figures 1 and 2(a) admitted prior art filters.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1724

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard L. Chiesa whose telephone number is (703) 308-3791.

The fax phone number for Art Unit 1724 where this application is assigned is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

December 31, 2002

Richard L. Chiesa

**Richard L. Chiesa
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724**

Dec. 31, 2002